	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Interview Summary	10/079,414	Hata et al
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Donghai Nguyen	3729

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Peter Vo

(2) Donghai Nguyen

Date of Interview 10/12/04

(3) Joseph Gorski

(4) Takashi ishihara

(5) Dhiren Odedra

Type: a)☐ Telephonic   b)☐ Video Conference
c)☑ Personal [copy is given to 1)☐ applicant 2)☑ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d)☐ Yes   e)☑ No. If yes, brief description:

_____

Claim(s) discussed: _____ of record _____

Identification of prior art discussed:

_____ of record _____

Agreement with respect to the claims f)☑ was reached. g)☐ was not reached. h)☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Discuss the lack of obviousness to combine Morita into Kamijima et al. and the different in operations of Morita and the claimed invention. the rejection appears to be overcome by the arguments of Applicants.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i)☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required